UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,549	09/24/2004	Gopesh Kumer	001-450	5548

37476   7590   03/04/2009
WHITE-WELKER & WELKER, LLC
P.O. BOX 199
CLEAR SPRING, MD 21722-0199

EXAMINER
MEJIA, ANTHONY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 December 2008</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 September 2004 and 19 May 2008</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Acknowledgement is made that that no additional amendments have been made
to the previously presented claims that were filed on 19 May 2008, which are now
currently pending and being presented. It has been noted that the status identifier for
Claim 1 contains a spelling error. Applicants are requested to verify the correctness of
all status identifiers in their next response.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: the limitation "having a
User initiate contact with **a Service Provider**" in line 6 of the claim. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 2-14 are also objected to as to at
least inheriting the same deficiency through their dependency to Claim 1. Appropriate
correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

        Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four
statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be
performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular
machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a
different state or thing. *See* page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385.

4.   The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that

accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and

therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. In the instant application, in Claim 1, a

method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising the steps of:

        "having…", "enabling…" and "connecting…" are broad enough that the claim

could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any

transformation apparent.

        In further, in the instant application, in Claim 15, a method of connecting two

parties in real time, the method comprising the steps of:

        "having an Agent account", "assigning…", "having a Service Provider enter said

Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor", "linking…", "distributing…", "enabling…"

and "connecting…" are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed

mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

        Claims 2-14 and Claims 16-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as to at

least inheriting the same deficiencies through their dependency to Claim 1 and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 6, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Faber et al. (US 7,308,422) (referred herein after as Faber 1) and in further view of

Lurie (US 2003/0115089) (referred herein after as Lurie 1).

        Regarding Claim 1, Faber 1 teaches a method of connecting two parties in real

time, the method comprising:

        having one or more Agents (wherein herein and after, an agent is being

interpreted as one who integrates and employs the system within their websites or other

Internet-based displayed and/or published materials offering a unique, differentiated

grouping of Service Providers who collectively employ the system, *see* para [0014] of

Applicant's disclosure) (e.g., a logic unit within controller computer 300 presents

specialized webpage(s) to customers) having an associated selected plurality of Service

Providers (col.3, lines 61-64, col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-22, and col.8, lines 27-57);

        enabling said Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into

their own specialized websites for browsing by a User (col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-

22, and col.8, lines 27-57);

        having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via an Agent' s specialized

website (col.8, lines 63-67 and col.9, lines 1-8). Faber 1 does not explicitly teach the

final step of:

        connecting said User with said Service Provider if available.

        However, Lurie 1 in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and

method for online advice customer relationship management including the step of:

connecting a User with a Service Provider if available (par [0088]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the teachings of Faber to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber and Lurie 1 to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie: pars [0006-0007]).

Regarding Claim 6, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

displaying said Service Provider's hours of availability within a pop-up window (Lurie 1: pars [0081-0082]).

Regarding Claim 9, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

having a system manage the transaction records for said Agent's Service Providers (Lurie 1: par [0043]).

Regarding Claim 10, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 9 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

including reporting said transaction records (Lurie 1: par [0043] and [0065]).

Regarding Claim 11, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 9 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Laurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

calculating the amount due to the Service Provider based on the Service Provider's transactions (Faber 1: col.10, lines 49-53).

Regarding Claim 12, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 11 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

paying the Service Provider and the Agent the amount due based on the transactions (Faber 1: col.10, lines 49-53).

Regarding Claim 13, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

assigning an Agent ID number (e.g., user name) to an Agent account (e.g., account(s) on database 310), (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-21).

7.   Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Faber 1 in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Faber et al. (US 6,865,540)

(referred herein after as Faber 2).

        Regarding Claim 2, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the

method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie

1do not teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

        generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider ;

        checking to see if the Service Provider is available.

        However, Faber 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and

apparatus for providing group calls via the Internet including the steps of:

         generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider (col.5,

lines 20-50 and *see* fig.3);

        checking to see if the Service Provider is available (col.5, lines 20-50, and *see*

fig.3).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Faber 2 in the teachings of Faber 1 and

Lurie 1 to enable the user of the system to be able to get information of a service

provider and seeing if said service provider's availability. One of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the

teachings of Faber 1/Lurie/Faber 2 to help match users of the system with the

appropriate service providers (Faber 2: col.1, lines 25-31).

Regarding Claim 3, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Faber 2 teach the

method as described in claim 2 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie

1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

having said pop-up window prompting said User to enter their phone number to

make said connection (Faber 2: col.4, lines 50-64, *see* fig.4).

Regarding Claim 4, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/ Faber 2 teach the

method as described in claim 2 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie

1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

generating a message for said User in said pop-up window when said Service

Provider is not available (Lurie 1: par [0082]).

Regarding Claim 5, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/ Faber 2 teach the

method as described in claim 2 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie

1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

allowing said Service Provider to enter their hours of availability (Faber 1: col.8,

lines 6-18).

8.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in

further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Lurie et al. (US 7,289,623) (referred herein

after as Lurie 2).

        Regarding Claim 7, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the

method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Lurie 1 and Faber 1

do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

        denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours

said Service Provider is scheduled to be not available.

        However, Lurie 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for

an online speaker patch-through, including the step of:

    denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours said

Service Provider is scheduled to be not available (col.5, lines 43-54).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 2 in the combined teachings of

Faber 1/Lurie 11 in order to prevent the service seeker from trying to connect to the

service provider when the service provider is not available. One of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the

teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/ Lurie 2 to help the service seekers of the system know

what service providers are readily available in real-time (Lurie 2: col.1, lines 65-67, and

col.2, lines 1-2).

9.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in

further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Faber et al. (US 2004/0252820) (referred

herein after as Faber 3).

        Regarding Claim 8, Faber 1/Lurie 1 teaches the method as described in Claim 1

above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 do not explicitly disclose wherein the

method further comprises the step of:

        displaying in said a pop-up window that said Service Provider is currently busy

on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call.

        However, Faber 3 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method

for arranging a call including the step of:

        displaying in said a pop-up window that said Service Provider is currently busy

on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call (par [0053])

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Faber in the combined teachings of Faber

1/Lurie 1 in order to properly notify the service seeker of the system that the Service

Provider's is temporarily not available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber

1/Lurie 1/Faber 3 to provide a more user friendly interaction between the users of the

system and service providers (Faber 3: par [0003]).

10.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1

in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Rigole (US 7,139,728).

        Regarding Claim 14, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 teach the

method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1

do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

        distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly

registered Service Provider.

        However, Rigole in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for

online selection of service providers of server accounts including the step of:

        distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly

registered Service Provider (col.17, lines 1-20).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings of

Faber 1 and Lurie 1 to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML

code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings

of Faber 1/Lurie 1 and Rigole to allow the service providers to dynamically present there

services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the

system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10)

11.   Claims 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Faber 1 in further view of Rigole (US 7,139,728) and in further view of Lurie 1.

        Regarding Claim 15, Faber 1 teaches a method of connecting two parties in real

time, the method comprising:

        having an Agent account (Faber 1: e.g., account set up on the database, col.4,

lines 10-51);

        assigning an Agent ID (e.g., certain information such as a username) number to

said Agent account (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-51);

        having a Service Provider enter said Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor

(Faber 1: e.g., during registration, a Service Provider is requested to submit certain

information, col.4, lines 10-51);

        linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into one account information

and transaction activity management interface (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-51);

        enabling the Agent to readily create own Internet-based collection of specialized

Service Providers (Faber 1: col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-22, and col.8, lines 27-57).

        Faber 1 does not explicitly teach the step of:

        distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly

registered Service Provider thereby.

        However, Rigole in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for

online selection of service providers of server accounts including the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider thereby (e.g., files that a Service Provider desires to make available to its consumers, may be uploaded in HTML to the Interchange Party Communication System having means of presenting user interfaces to consumer computer systems displaying services being offered by Service Providers, col.16, lines 61-67 and col.17, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Lurie 1 to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1 and Rigole to allow the service providers to dynamically present there services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10). The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Rigole do not explicitly teach the step of:

connecting Users with these Service Providers for expert advice in real time via a telephone connection.

However, Lurie 1 in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for online advice customer relationship management including the step of:

connecting Users with these Service Providers for expert advice in real time via a telephone connection (par [0088]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the teachings of Faber to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

Regarding Claim 16, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

displaying within a pop-up window a full list of an Agent's Service Provider's and their individual availability statuses (Faber 1: col.8, lines 22-36 and *see* fig.6).

Regarding Claim 17, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Lurie 1/Rigole further teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

monitoring how long telephonic connections are maintained between said Users and said Service Providers (Faber 1: col.10, lines 43-53); and

deducting from Users' consumer accounts the amounts based upon how long the telephonic connections are maintained (Faber 1: col.10, lines 43-53).

Regarding Claim 19, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

giving an Agent the option of self-managed payroll responsibility or, a managed payout consisting of (col.5, lines 1-5, col.10, lines 43-53 and *see* fig.4):

deducting a pre-determined Agent service fee for each transaction and distributing the Agent to fee said Agents (col.10, lines 51-53).

12.   Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Rigole in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Lund (US 7,403,947).

Regarding Claim 18, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows.

However, Lund in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing computer-network related information about a calling party including the steps of:

allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows (it is a well-known feature, that websites may contain a series of progressive popup windows) (e.g., after a call is answered by a service provider, a customer may interact with the business website of the service provider, for continuing advertising and shopping during the course of a conversation between the customer and service provider, col.6, lines 53-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lund in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 to allow users to continually interact with the agent while be connected to the Service Providers. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Luire 1/Lund to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

13.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Rigole in further view of Lurie 1 in further view of Boubez et al. (US 2002/0087340) (referred herein after as Boubez) and in further view of Faber 2.

Regarding Claim 20, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above. The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

having recognition, across the entire database (database 310) of Service Provider's telephone numbers including potentially multiple different accounts, of whether a particular Service Provider's telephone line is busy thereby (Lurie 1: e.g., real-time availability statuses, par [0082]). The combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups.

However, Boubez in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for categorizing services including the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups (e.g., categories) (e.g., the service provider decides, at registration time, in which category or categories the service is to be registered, pars [0038], [0066-0068], and [0073]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Boubez in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1 to enable the service providers to be part of various categories made available to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez to minimize the difficulty for the users of the system in locating the service provider they desire (par [0006]).

In further, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez do not explicitly teach the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups, *without concern for any potential telephone connection conflict.*

However, Faber 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing group calls via the Internet including the step of:

not having a concern for any potential telephone connection conflict (e.g., Service-providers are capable of having two-way connections with different users of the system, that are controlled by a moderator, thus avoiding conflicts, col.3, lines 35-45, col.6, lines 1-26, and col.8, lines 38-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez with the teachings of Faber 2 to avoid conflicts in a telephone connection with the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber 1/Rigole/Lurie 1/Boubez/Faber 2 to allow the Service Providers to provide services simultaneously to multiple users of the system.

Response to Arguments

14.   Applicant's arguments, see pages 6-11, filed 04 December 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-3, 4-6, and 9-14 under 102 (e) and Claims 7-8, and 15-20 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the newly discovered references cited above.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular paragraphs, columns, and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY MEJIA whose telephone number is (571)270-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30AM-8:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mejia, Anthony/
Patent Examiner

/Salad Abdullahi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457